

Application No. 09/342,949

### REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the application.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-9 and 20-26 stand rejected.

Claims 10-19 are allowed.

Claims 10 and 15 are independent claims.

Claim 20 has been amended to more clearly recite its subject matter. Applicants do not believe the amendment to be narrowing, and, more importantly, the amendment is not required for patentability.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 20-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of US Patent No. 6,337,745 B1 to Aiello, Jr. et al (Aiello et al.) and US Patent No. 6,678,068 B1 to Richter et al (Richter et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed

In claim 1, Applicants recite a graphical user interface for providing job tickets and print job information on a display screen for a printing system. The interface includes a depiction of a pathway access window including a print queue icon, a depiction of a printer status window including a printer icon; and a depiction of a job ticket window displaying a job ticket for each print job by selecting the print queue icon, wherein each job ticket is associated with a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket.

Claim 1 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03.

The Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1. For example, in claim 1, Applicants recite "a depiction of a job ticket window displaying a job ticket for each print job by selecting the print queue icon, wherein each job ticket is associated with a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket." Claim 1 plainly recites that each job ticket is associated with an

Application No. 09/342,949

icon indicating whether resources are available for the job. The Examiner admits that Aiello Jr. et al. does not show this limitation, but asserts that Richter, et al. teaches a job ticket associated with an icon indicating whether resources are available for the job. However, the passage and the drawing cited by the Examiner do not support this assertion.

The Examiner has not established that Richter et al. discloses a job ticket icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources to complete the print job associated with the job ticket. The Examiner points to three different portions of Richter et al. to support his assertion: (1) state of file icon 96 and column 11, lines 46-53, (2) column 12, lines 12-18, and (3) FIGS. 24-25. However, none of the portions cited by the Examiner appear to disclose an icon that discloses whether resources are available for a particular job. A user selects state of file icon 96 to arrive at a screen 140 that indicates where in the printing process a job is. For example, SPOOLING, RIPPING, and PRINTING are states that may be displayed on screen 140. The Examiner has not shown that the icon 96 shows whether resources are available for a job or that the accompanying passage in column 11 describes such an icon. The passage in column 12, lines 12-18 does not mention any icons, let alone a job ticket icon indicating whether resources are available for a job. FIGS. 24 illustrates a consumables screen and FIG. 25 illustrates a screen showing a series of job tickets. However, neither screen shows an icon indicating whether there are sufficient resources for a particular job, let alone an icon associated with each job ticket.

As the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

For each of the above reasons, claims 2-9 and 26 should be allowed as claims 2-9 and 26 each depend from claim 1.

Applicants recite in claim 20, a method for managing resources for print jobs, which includes displaying one or more print job tickets in a print queue, identifying print job information necessary to complete print jobs based on contents of the print job tickets, prompting modules for resource status information, receiving resource status information from modules, comparing resource status information to print job information for each job ticket, displaying a first icon indicating that resources are available to complete print jobs for each job ticket where resources are sufficient, and displaying a

Application No. 09/342,949

second icon indicating that resources are unavailable to complete print jobs for each job ticket where resources are insufficient.

Claim 20 should be allowed as the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner must show that a combination of references actually teaches or suggests all the limitations of a claim. MPEP 2143.03.

The Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 20 as filed or as currently amended. For example, in original claim 20, Applicants recite displaying a first icon indicating that resources are available to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are sufficient, and displaying a second icon indicating that resources are unavailable to complete print jobs for job tickets, where resources are insufficient. The Examiner asserts Richter et al. shows first and second icons that indicate sufficient and insufficient resources respectively. The Examiner points to FIGS. 24-25. However, The Examiner has not pointed to an icon indicating resources are available for job tickets or an icon showing resources are unavailable for job tickets. The Examiner points to icons showing printer resources generally. However, these icons do not appear to indicate whether resources are available for a job ticket or tickets. The Examiner also points to an error/warnings tab, which he claims discloses an icon indicating resources are unavailable for a job ticket or tickets. However, a tab for an unseen screen is not the same as an icon indicating resources for job tickets are unavailable. Further, the Examiner has pointed to no part of any of the patents that discloses two icons, one indicating that sufficient resources are available, the other indicating that insufficient resources are not available. As the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of references teaches all the limitations of Applicants' claims, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Amended claim 20 further clarifies that each job ticket has a corresponding icon.

For each of the above reasons, claims 21-25 should be allowed as claims 21-25 each depend from claim 20.


Application No. 09/342,949

**Conclusion**

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph M. Young  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,248  
Telephone (585) 423-4554

JMY/gmm